From: PARRETT Kevin <kevin.parrett@state.or.us>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Barbara Quinn; Knudsen, Laura; Von Burg, Annie
Cc: Peter deFur; MCCLINCY Matt; Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group members; GREENFIELD Sarah
Subject: RE: 85% discussion
Attachments: DEQ PHCAG Meeting 10-12-16.pptx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Barbara. Thanks for providing Sarah, Matt and me the opportunity to meet with the PHCAG last Wednesday. During our meeting we summarized the State's comments on EPA's proposed plan. We showed several figures including the figure EPA used in explaining site-wide risk reduction for Alternative I, which you reference as the 85% risk reduction figure. We also showed a figure created by DEQ comparing risk reduction among the various remedial alternatives for individual sediment decision units. Attached is the two figures. We explained that DEQ has not stated a preference for a particular alternative. DEQ/State concurrence will be determined prior to EPA issuing the Record of Decision. In the mean time it should not be assumed that DEQ agrees with Alternative I. If you would like further explanation of the two risk reduction figures, Sarah Greenfield and DEQ's toxicologist, Mike Paulsen, would be happy to follow up with you.

Kevin Parrett, Manager

NW Region Cleanup Program

Oregon DEQ

From: Barbara Quinn (b) (6)
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Knudsen, Laura; PARRETT Kevin; Von Burg, Annie
Cc: Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group members; Peter deFur
Subject: 85% discussion

Laura, Kevin and Annie,
DEQ at our last PHCAG general meeting explained that they support the 85% human risk reduction offered supposedly by option I. So now we have EPA, Nick FIsh's office at the City of Portland and DEQ all supporting this 85%

theory that has never been explained to the Community Advisory or the public in any way.

Kevin said it refers to fish toxicity reduction. Can any of you please explain how 85% risk reduction would be acheived if you do not have any research data showing where people fish, how often they fish and what they are catching in the lower Willamette? Or othewise how you arrived at the 85% reduction theory?

To support the theory, we would need a study of who, what, where, how often people fish. Would EPA, DEQ or the City be willing to fund such a study?
thanks,
Barbara Quinn,
PHCAG